

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

THOMAS LEROY FULLER (#237590),

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 2:13-CV-13171  
JUDGE MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE ANTHONY P. PATTI

v.

DAVID KERR,  
GARY DAVIS,  
JANET COCHRAN and  
JOHN HAWLEY,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER SETTING DEADLINE FOR PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED RESPONSE  
TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (DE 48)**

At this time, the only motion pending in this case is Defendants' December 31, 2014 motion to dismiss and for summary judgment (DE 48). Plaintiff has filed a response (DE 55), and Defendants have filed a reply (DE 57).

Just a few days before Defendants filed their dispositive motion, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel compliance with a subpoena served upon Colonel Kriste Kibbey Etue, Director of the Michigan State Police. DE 47. On April 1, 2015, I entered an order (DE 59) which, in part, granted Plaintiff's motion. Then, on April 8, 2015, I entered an order (DE 60) order granting in part and denying in part

Defendants' motion to compel discovery (DE 20) and granting in part and denying in part Plaintiff's motion for a protective order (DE 38).

By way of a letter dated April 22, 2015 and filed on April 27, 2015 (DE 61), Plaintiff informed the Court that the MSP had yet to comply. However, by way of a letter dated April 29, 2015 and filed May 4, 2015 (DE 62), Plaintiff acknowledged receipt of correspondence from the MSP. Attached to this filing are authorization forms for St. Mary's of Michigan and MDOC's MBP. DE 62 at 2-5.<sup>1</sup>

Upon consideration, Plaintiff may file an amended or supplemental response, if he so chooses, no later than Monday, June 8, 2015.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: s/ Anthony P. Patti  
Anthony P. Patti  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

I certify that a copy of this document was sent to parties of record on Friday, May 11, 2015, electronically and/or by U.S. Mail.

s/Michael L. Williams  
Case Manager to the  
Honorable Anthony P. Patti

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that Plaintiff has not redacted his social security number from one of these attachments. *See, i.e.,* DE 62 at 2, 4 & 5. For Plaintiff's information, as acknowledged in this Court's *Procedures Governing the Electronic Availability and Redaction of Transcripts*, "amendments to the Federal Civil and Criminal Rules of Procedure that took effect on December 1, 2007, require that personal identification information be redacted from documents filed with the court - individuals' Social Security numbers, names of minor children, financial account numbers, dates of birth, and, in criminal cases, home addresses."